

Application No. 09/314,058
Amendment dated December 10, 2003
Reply to Office Action of October 1, 2003

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action claims 28-30, 32, 33, 35-37 and 39-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hitachi (JP 05-197444) in view of Mitsubishi (JP 02-129689) and in further view of Matsushita (JP 06-161636). Dependent claims 31 and 38 were indicated as having allowable subject matter. Hence, pursuant to this amendment, claims 31 and 38 have been made independent. Further, claims 28-30, 34, 35, 37 and 39 have been canceled, whereas, claim 32 has been amended to depend from claim 31, and claims 36 and 41 have been amended to depend from claim 38.

In a telephone conversation on or about December 2, 2003, the Applicant's representative discussed with the Examiner, in general terms only, amendments to the claims. For example, Applicant's representative was concerned that merely reiterating claim limitations of a base claim and intervening claims verbatim would render an amended claim that was unreadable. Thus, the Examiner requested that the Applicant's representative discuss the changes made to claims 31 and 38 in the Remarks section. As such, the following explanation is provided.

As amended, claim 31 incorporates the subject matter of canceled claims 28, 29 and 30. Thus, claim 31 has been rewritten to include the limitations of base claim 28 and intervening claims 29 and 30 with little, if any variation.

Likewise, claim 38 has been amended to include essentially the same subject matter previously recited in claims 35, 37 and 38. However, amended claim 38 has been rewritten to provide for flow within the claim. For example, canceled claim 37 called for a first display hingedly connected to a second display. As amended, claim 38 calls for a second display hingedly connected to a first display. Thus, the hinged connection, although claimed differently has been preserved in amended claim 38.

Further, canceled claim 35 called for a unit separate from the first and second displays. As amended, claim 38 calls for a separate unit containing a keyboard. Thus, the separate nature of the unit is preserved in amended claim 38.

Application No. 09/314,058
Amendment dated December 10, 2003
Reply to Office Action of October 1, 2003

Last, canceled claim 35 called for at least one hinge to couple one of the first and second displays to the unit. Prior to amendment, claim 38 recited, "the unit is hingedly connected to the first display." Thus, prior to amendment, dependent claim 38 specified that the hinge connection is to the first display. As such, amended claim 38 calls for a hinge to connect the unit to the first display. Thus, the configuration of former dependent claim 38 is present in amended claim 38. However, the broader configuration recited in canceled independent claim 35 has been eliminated in amended claim 38. Accordingly, as amended, claim 38 is believed to include substantially the same subject matter as claims 38, 37 and 35, which has been rewritten in a more readable form.

In sum, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Thus, although after final, the Examiner is requested to enter the amendments. That is, furtherance toward allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: December 10, 2003

Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No.: 21906